

United States Marshals. The protested order, in short, bars and enjoins Azubuko's filing of any document or pleading of any kind with the court as a pro se plaintiff unless Azubuko first seeks leave of the court and a judge of the court grants this leave.¹

After reviewing the seven counts set forth in his complaint against Judge Pisano, I recommend that this complaint should be dismissed as frivolous. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).²

NOTICE

A party may file objections to those specified portions of a magistrate judge's report or proposed findings or recommended decisions entered pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) for which *de novo* review by the district court is sought, together with a supporting memorandum, within ten (10) days of being served with a copy thereof. A responsive memorandum shall be filed within ten (10) days after the filing of the objection.

Failure to file a timely objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the district court and to appeal the district court's order.

/s/ Margaret J. Kravchuk
U.S. Magistrate Judge

October 31, 2006.

¹ A cursory search on the U.S. Party/Case Index turns up 140 federal, primarily civil, cases to which "Chukwuma Azubuko" was/is a party.

² Because this is a recommended decision Azubuko has an opportunity to respond to this sua sponte disposition before it becomes final. See Griffiths v. Amtrak, No. 03-1591, 2004 WL 1754043, *1 (1st Cir. Aug. 6, 2004) (not selected for publication)